



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

On the other hand, is the subjunctive a milder imperative than the indicative? I think not. The Latin subjunctive had already acquired an imperative force, before the Romance peoples fell heir to it. (*Vos*) *amatis me*, therefore, must have seemed to them a milder form of command than (*vos*) *ametis me*. In English we observe the same mode of expression when we say *you do this*, or *you will do this*, instead of the abrupt *do this*.

SAMUEL GARNER.

VARIA.

I.—*Parodies and Resemblances*.—In the fourth number of this Journal I called attention to the resemblance between Aristoph. Acharn. 790 and Soph. Antig. 513, not venturing positively to pronounce the former a parody on the latter. I am now convinced that it is not a parody upon that particular passage, but is a sort of *παρατραγωδία*. The mode of expression found in the two verses seems to have been a common one, so common that absolute identity of words would have been requisite, perhaps, to remind the audience of any particular verse that they had heard. Accordingly, I find in Euripides a verse which is, in some respects, more like the verse of Aristophanes than is that of Sophocles. It is Iph. Taur. 800:

ὦ συγκασιγνήτη τε καὶ ταύτοῦ πατρός.

If now we compare v. 497:

πότερον ἀδελφὸν μητρός ἔστων ἐκ μιᾶς;

and the two verses under discussion:

ῥμαιμος ἐκ μιᾶς τε καὶ ταύτοῦ πατρός—

ῥμοματρία γάρ ἔστι κῆρ τωδὲ πατρός—

and bear in mind that the Iph. Taur. was probably produced after the Acharn., it becomes almost certain that the expression in question was merely a species of circumstantiality frequently employed by those who affected lofty speech. (Cf. Herc. Fur. 843, Phoen. 156. In Nub. 1372 *ῥμομητρίαν* is used for a special reason.) If this expression were found only in the Acharn. and the Iph. Taur. it would probably be regarded as sufficient grounds for placing the latter chronologically before the former, an illustration of the caution necessary in attempting to draw conclusions from limited data.

II.—*A Fragment of Euripides*.—Stobaeus gives in the Florilegium a certain passage, consisting of eighteen iambic trimeters, as belonging to Menander; and Buttmann, Reisig, and Meineke maintained that this was correct, whilst Henri Estienne, followed by Bentley and others, assigned the first three verses to Menander and the rest to Euripides. But the latest decision of most critics was that the first *two* verses were from Menander, and the rest from a tragedian, not necessarily Euripides. (Graux in Rev. de Phil., vol. I, p. 210–11.) Now Choricus gives (Apol. Mim. VII 4) a portion of this passage beginning just where Estienne claimed that the Euripidean part commenced, and at the end he says: ἀκούεις ἀνδρὸς μισογύνου καὶ σώφρονος—of course, Euripides. Of the fifteen tragic verses Choricus gives six, but between the third and fourth he has a verse not in Stobaeus, making seven in all. The passage then runs thus:

τὸ μὲν μέγιστον οὐ ποτ' ἄνδρα χρὴ σοφὸν
 λίαν φυλάσσειν¹ ἄλοχον ἐν μυχοῖς δόμων·
 ἐρᾷ γὰρ ὅψις τῆς θύραθεν ἡδονῆς,
 ἐρᾷ δ' ἀκούειν ὧν φυλάττεται¹ κλύειν,
 ἐν δ' ἀφθόνοισι τοῖσδ' ἀναστρωφωμένη
 βλέπουσά τ' εἰς πᾶν καὶ παροῦσα πανταχοῦ,
 τὴν ὕψιν ἐμπλήσας ἀπήλλακται κακῶν.

Of the fourth verse Graux says: “Dans la citation de Chorikios est intercalé un vers que n'a pas l'extrait de Stobée.” He cannot mean that it was added, but that it is interpolated relatively to the extract of Stobaeus, from whom he says Choricus probably took the passage, it being at that time properly assigned. This would imply that the verse in question was accidentally dropped by subsequent copyists of Stobaeus, and also that they omitted the name of Euripides. It is tolerably certain, however, that Stobaeus himself took many of his extracts from a similar collection made by some predecessor; and in copying this passage he failed, perhaps, to note the author, and, misled by the repetition of ἐρᾷ, omitted the verse found in Choricus; whilst the latter, copying, in my opinion, *from the same original*, did not commit either blunder.

But I have written this more especially to call attention to the fact that, with the new verse, the transition from ἐρᾷ γὰρ ὅψις to

¹ Graux says nothing about φυλάσσειν, φυλάττεται.

ἐρᾷ δ' ἀκούειν (sc. γυνή) is hard. It seems possible that some one—say the author of the work from which Stobaeus and Choricus copied—assuming that in v. 7 ὅφιν must refer to ὅφιν in v. 3, changed the latter into ὅφιν, so that the shade of meaning might be the same, failing to observe that the next verse would then suffer a change of subject. I merely suggest these views for the consideration of others: I would not propose to “emend.”

III.—*Caesura in Euripides*.—In an article on certain effects of elision, published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1879, I have shown that Euripides virtually never neglected the main caesura in iambic trimeters. Only three exceptions were noted, one of which, Hel. 86, being a conjecture, was rejected. That investigation did not include the Cyclops nor the fragments. It is my purpose now to examine the subject again. The examples in Dindorf's text of verses without caesura or its equivalent (in addition to Hel. 86) are, as far as known to me, the following:

- (1) Suppl. 303: σφάλλει γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ μόνω, πᾶλλ' εἰ φρονῶν.
- (2) Cycl. 7: Ἐγχελάδων ἰτέαν μέσην θινῶν δορι—
- (3) Frag. 284, 23: στάς. ἄνδρας οὖν ἐχρήν σοφούς τε καὶ αἰσχροὺς—
- (4) Bacch. 1125: λαβούσα δ' ὠλέναις ἀριστερὰν χεῖρα—
- (5) New frag. (Blass): ὀρθοσταδὸν, λόγχαις ἐπείγοντες φόν[ον].

The first and fourth are the exceptions alluded to before. In the *Revue de Philologie* II I, p. 37, Herwerden has rejected the first for other than metrical reasons. Its suppression seems so nearly justifiable that it cannot be admitted as a genuine exception. In the example from Cyclops I have (in this Journal, No. 2, p. 190) restored the MS reading ἐς ἰτέαν (with synizesis). The third example is the work of Musurus, the verse being defective in MSS. Dobrée proposed ἄνδρας οὖν χρήν τοὺς σοφούς, which has at least the merit of being possible. In the article just referred to I expressed a temptation to write ὠλέναις' in the fourth example, a temptation that is increased by the fifth example, which has been discovered since I discussed the subject; for it is certainly striking that this verse should admit the quasi-caesura by exactly the same device. Some able grammarians maintain, indeed, that it would be absurd to add -ι to the dative plural in the first and second declensions merely for the purpose of eliding it; and this is true in almost every situation except this one; but in this case I have

shown that the vowel must have been sounded a little. And hence it is that the canon relating to the elision of *-ι* in the dative plural in Attic can have no weight in settling this question. The *-ι* is not essential to these forms, and the only objection to assuming its elision is the one just referred to, and, as I said, that objection does not hold in the present case. To this it may be replied that Homer elides the *-ι* of the third declension but not of the first and second. But this would be to beg the question. If Homer does not elide in the first and second declensions, it is because the forms without final *-ι* were in use. Moreover, in Homer *-ης* and *-ους* nearly always precede a vowel; so general indeed is this fact that Nauck attempts to remove all the exceptions. While he probably goes too far in this, still there is good reason for writing *-ησ'* and *-ουσ'* before vowels.

But there is another standpoint from which the subject must be viewed. The fact that in all the plays of Euripides there are so nearly no instances of neglected caesura is a ground for believing that these instances are either only apparent or erroneous. But would this argument not apply also to elision of *-ι* in the dative plural? Let us see. We must confine our investigation to those positions where it is necessary to assume elision. One of these is at the end of the third foot when there is no break of any kind in this or the following foot. The elisions of this sort in Euripides (excluding the dative plural) are one hundred and twenty-seven (127) plus the number in the fragments; and the dative plural occurs twice in that position. These being the only instances of supposed absence of caesura, it follows that the above argument against neglected caesura is more weighty than the same argument against elision of the dative plural, in proportion as the entire number of iambic trimeters in Euripides exceeds 127 + . There is one other place where elision is desirable—at the so-called Porsonic pause, when the well-known law seems to be violated (see article above mentioned). The instances of this elision, as far as “emendations” have not prevented me from finding them, are, in all the tragedians, *thirty*, in Euripides alone, *twenty-three*; and there is *one* verse in which elision of the dative plural would excuse the neglect of the law: Ion, 1:

Ἄτλας, ὃ χαλκείοισι νότοις οὐρανὸν—

where Ritschl and some others thought the words were intended to labor in sympathy with the toiling son of Japetus, a notion unworthy of the great philologist. This whole passage, however,

has been emended, or rather rewritten, by Dindorf; and others have in different ways altered the first verse. The second requires some change, but the first would probably be let alone but for the violation of Porson's law.

All of these suggestions are merely tentative. I should not venture to write *-αισ'* and *-οισ'*, and yet I am not willing to admit the verses under discussion as exceptions to the observance of caesura, even if we assume (as has been done in this whole discussion) that the verses in question are not in some way corrupt. This is, however, by no means certain. If in Bacch. 1125 we change *ὠλέναις ἀριστεράν* into *ὠλέναισι δεξιάν*, the caesura is restored without impairing the sense; in fact, the situation is rendered more appropriate. Why then should Euripides have selected "left" rather than "right," thereby introducing what we must in any case concede to be an unusual license? Compare, too, the account of Ovid (Met. III 708—731) which agrees in the main with that of Euripides: in the latter, *Agave λαβούσα . . . ἀριστεράν χεῖρα . . . ἀπεσπάραξεν ὄμρον*, and *Ino τὰπὶ θάτερ' ἐξειργάζετο ῥηγνύσα σάρκας*, whilst in the former, "*dextram* precanti abstulit (sc. *Agave*); *Ino* lacerata est altera raptu." (Cf. Heracl. 844.) But how could *δεξιάν* get changed into *ἀριστεράν*? I cannot give a perfectly satisfactory answer. Some one may have written *ἀριστεράν* or *ἀριστερά* on the margin to explain *τὰπὶ θάτερ'* four lines below, and this may have found its way into the wrong verse. To assume what has been called a *heterophemy*, or rather what might be called a *heterography*, would perhaps look too much like catching at a straw.

In Blass's fragment (see Rhein. Museum, 1879, p. 290 ff., Rev. de Phil. IV 2, p. 121) *λόγχαις ἐπείγοντες φό[νον]* may have come from *λόγχαισι τείνοντες φόνον* (sc. *εἰς αὐτούς*: cf. Hec. 263). I have also thought of *πράζοντες* and *ποριωδόντες*. Five lines below, where the narrative returns to the subject of *ἐπείγοντες*, we have *οἱ δ' εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν πίτυλον ἤπειγ[ον δορός]*, *πέτραι τ' ἐχώρου* κτέ. This may have led to the substitution of *ἐπείγω*, in the verse in question, for some verb bearing no special resemblance to it. This, however, is hazardous, and apart from the wanting caesura there seems to be no good reason for attempting an emendation.

Here I let the matter rest, with the hope that others will examine these verses, and also cite any more of the same sort that I may have overlooked. It would not be worth while, however, to pay any attention to instances which are the result of rash conjecture. In my discussion I have referred only to those which Dindorf thought

worthy of a place in his text. If we undertake to scrutinize the conjectures of all, there is no end to the task before us, and no limit to the absurdity that we shall encounter. An "emendation" of J. H. Hogan, for an instance, gives us an example of a verse (Med. 1349) without caesura, thus:

οὐ παῖδας οὐδ' ἐθρεψάμην καὶ ἄξιον οὐ σὺ (!)

Nor is any regard to be had to lyric hexapodies, for they have no caesura. Freund (Trien. Phil. V, p. 198) cites, as an example, Eur. Troad. 1305:

γεραιά τ' εἰς πῆδον τιθῆϊσα μέλαινα (!)

He should have given the antistrophic verse where the MSS contain a real example.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

A GREEK INSCRIPTION CONCERNING GOLGOI.

An inscription on a statue in the Cesnola Collection is interesting in view of Vogüé's guess as to the locality of Golgoi. Hagios Photios, where Cesnola discovered the temple and the sculptures within and outside of it, is twenty minutes' walk, I am informed by General Di Cesnola, from Hagios Georgios, the site of the ancient grave-yard. The edge of the latter is only ten minutes' walk from the temple. It is in this graveyard that the statue was found, a seated woman whose left hand rests on a box held in the right hand of a small figure standing at her left side—all in the limestone of the place. It is known in the Cesnola Collection as No. (Inscr.) 164, i. e. in the Series of Inscriptions No. 164. The inscription is on the base and declares the sculptor; it is Greek and in three lines:

Ζωίλος

Γύλιος

Ἐποίει

The shapes of the letters assign it to the Roman age of Cyprus, for *E*, *Σ* and *Ω* are in the round forms *ε*, *c*, *ω*; *Η* has both legs equal; and the extremities of all the letters flare a little. The *O*'s are smaller than the other letters. *Ζωίλος*, as Renan points out (see *Mission de Phénicie* index) may be the translation of a Semitic name; at any rate it is much commoner in Semitic countries in their Hellenized age than in Hellas proper. It occurs on two